



Wednesday, September 24, 2003  
2:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
CALTRANS DISTRICT 6 - MANCHESTER CENTER  
YOSEMITE ROOM, #145

## **Workshop Notes**

Attendee list attached.

2:00    *Opening Remarks and Introductions* ..... Georgiena Vivian

Ms. Vivian provided brief opening remarks focusing on a review of the study purpose and provided an introduction of the project staff. She requested attendees identify the type of agency/group they were from by a show of hands. Ms. Vivian stressed that the purpose of this study is to allow planners to have another tool to evaluate and implement policies and future land use and transportation scenarios. Ms. Vivian stressed that the study will not be used to critique current General Plans or other local agency planning documents.

2:20    *Project Status/Work Activity* ..... Georgiena Vivian

◆ *Synopsis of Workshop #1 Series*

Ms. Vivian indicated that meeting notes for the first two workshops were provided as handouts at the meeting.

◆ *Collection of Available Data and Resources*

Phil Erickson provided a quick overview of the status of geographic information system (GIS) data indicating that staff may be in touch with agencies to request further data, however great strides had been made since the first workshop regarding the collection of GIS data and files.

◆ *Purchase of What if and INDEX Models*

Mr. Lee and Mr. Erickson indicated that staff is in process of obtaining both the What if? and INDEX models that will be used for the Phase III study and that the models will be available for use beyond the study period.

Jeff Roberts, Granville Homes and David Lighthall, Relational Culture Institute asked specific questions regarding the model usage. Project Team staff responded confirming that the What if? model will be used to compare the base general plan scenario with alternatives that the group would develop at the next workshop. INDEX will score the scenarios for each indicator that will be discussed in another agenda item.

◆ *Receipt/Review of COG Models/Socioeconomic Files*

Richard Lee indicated that Fresno COG provided its transportation model to Project Team staff and has also provided permission to use the recently completed mode-split model.

Ms. Vivian further indicated that Fresno COG staff has been working with Caltrans to develop a new future socioeconomic file that will be available for use during development of the Phase III study.

◆ *Review of Affected Agency General Plan Policies*

Mr. Brian Smith indicated that he and Mr. Bruce O'Neal have been reviewing approved general plans for the counties of Fresno and Madera and the Cities of Clovis and Fresno to identify smart growth policies. It was further noted that Mr. Smith and Mr. O'Neal met with each of the local agencies (with exception of the City of Clovis) to review the policies list they had prepared to receive additional input and to refine the lists. Ms. Vivian noted that the list would continue to be reviewed and revised as additional policies are identified. Each of the policies was also listed by related indicator identified in Tables 1 and 2, which were handed out at the beginning of the workshop.

◆ *Identification of Smart Growth Indicators*

Ms. Vivian indicated that a considerable amount of work activity had occurred related to the identification and recommendation of indicators. Specifics related to this item were referred to in a separate agenda item discussed later at the workshop.

◆ *Presentations to Various Groups*

⇒ Environmental Justice Focus Group

Ms. Vivian explained that presentations have been made to various groups and invited Marta Frausto of Caltrans to provide a brief synopsis of a presentation made to the Environmental Justice Focus Group on September 19<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Frausto explained that the group identified specific indicators that it would like to see included in the study including proximity to clinics and proximity to major grocery stores or shopping.

2:30 *Overview of Meetings with the Elected Officials/Bodies* ..... Georgiena Vivian

Ms. Vivian provided an overview of meetings held with elected officials and the main categories of indicators raised as concerns, including: air quality, transportation, fiscal impacts and water consumption. A hand out summarizing the meetings with elected officials was provided to attendees.

2:40 *Recommended Smart Growth Indicators*..... Phil Erickson

◆ *Overview of Indicator Process*

- ⇒ What is an indicator?
- ⇒ How indicators are applied

Mr. Erickson provided a brief refresher of the purpose of indicators and how they will be applied during the modeling process. Ms. Vivian added that the goal of the workshop is to reach consensus at this workshop on the indicators that will be used for the study.

◆ *Review Recommended Tier 1 and Tier 2 Indicators*

Mr. Erickson explained the purpose of Tier 1 and 2 indicators. Tier 1 will be used as the main comparison factor between the base case (current General Plans) and each of the alternative scenarios that the groups will define and recommend at the next workshop(s). Tier 2 indicators will be considered if data is readily available. As the base case model is being developed over the next two months, Project Team staff will evaluate the utility of Tier 2 indicators.

◆ *Input from Workshop Attendees*

Mr. Erickson opened the floor for discussion regarding the proposed indicators in Tier 1 and 2. Mr. Erickson stressed that the importance of this discussion was to identify indicators that should either be moved to or from Tier 1 and any other indicators of importance to the groups that should be added to either table. The following bullets summarize the questions and decisions made during the discussion:

- ⇒ Mary Savala, League of Woman Voters, asked if there were any direct health indicators on the list?
  - Project Team staff responded that it would be difficult to make a direct link to a health issue without more information. For instance, it can be inferred that with the increase of air quality pollutants there would be an increase in asthma, etc., however there is not any readily available data to develop and assess an indicator related to increased asthma under various scenarios.
- ⇒ Tom Jordan, SJVUAPCD, asked if there was a reason indicators were listed by vehicle miles traveled as opposed to number of trips, since many air quality categories are calculated by trips?
  - Ms. Vivian responded that the air quality indicators were just placeholders and that she would be contacting the Air District to receive more technical input.

- ⇒ Al Solis, Sol Development Associates LLC, asked if the ranking of the indicators would assess the viability of General Plan policies.
  - Ms. Vivian reiterated that this study will not critique current general plan documents, but focus on development of the tools so that the agencies could enhance the implementation of their plans and/or update the plans following the Phase II study process.
- ⇒ Nick Paladino, Fresno Cycling Club, inquired how bicycling fits into the indicators, and how we could determine the likelihood of usage since 8 miles is probably the cut-off for people's willingness to use this mode?
  - Mr. Lee responded that looking at bicycling for connectivity would fit nicely into an expanded study beyond this scope of work. The Project Team would need the bike lanes and trails coded in GIS in order to use it now, however you could possibly assume bike lanes on all arterials, etc. during one of the scenarios.
  - Mr. Erickson further added that we should consider looking at commute trip length.
  - Ms. Vivian also noted that major assumptions would have to be made regarding the percentage of trips that would shift from autos to bicycling given the design of the future bike network.
- ⇒ Jeff Roberts, Granville Homes asked staff to look at adding an indicator for mass transit emissions and Jeff Harris, BIA, inquired about the financial impacts of smart growth on real estate development costs.
  - Staff agreed to look at emissions of mass transit vehicles if data was available and Mr. Teifion Rice-Evans indicated that his staff could evaluate the effect of smart growth policies on the average cost of real estate development.
- ⇒ David Lighthall inquired as to whether or not the models could analyze per acre employment as the density indicator in Table 2, #5g identified.
  - Staff clarified that although this study is looking at the regional scale, the models can be used on a block-by-block or acre basis given reliance on GIS data and files.
- ⇒ Patience Milrod asked why we have indicated light vehicle emissions under the air quality indicators but not heavy duty?
  - Ms. Vivian agreed that looking at heavy-duty vehicle emissions is an important issue and she will work with the Air District to refine the indicators under Improved Air Quality.
- ⇒ Leonard Garoupa, Madera County Planning Director, asked how many alternative scenarios would be run.
  - Ms. Vivian indicated that it will depend on budget and time, however the best guess right now is three or four at a minimum.
- ⇒ Lynn Gorman, Fresno County inquired as to the difference between Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicators and the importance of separating them during this meeting.
  - Mr. Erickson explained that a number of indicators are direct outputs of the modeling process and will be available, but unless they are listed as a Tier 1 or 2 indicators, they may not be directly reported. Further, he explained that staff would try to look at Tier 2 indicators if enough data is available and staff feels the indicator is valid based on the data availability. He further indicated that, at a minimum, Project Team staff would at least identify the data and

resources needed to address Tier 2 indicators in subsequent modeling applications beyond the Phase III study.

- ⇒ Terry Parker, Caltrans asked why some of the listed pollutants were being looked at, particularly CO if Fresno was an attainment location?
  - Ms. Vivian agreed that CO may not be pertinent, however some other pollutants may be desired like PM 10 or PM 2.5 and she will talk with the Air District to identify the appropriate pollutants.
- ⇒ Al Solis asked if the GIS data properly reflected the development in Southeastern Madera County.
  - Mr. Erickson responded that the maps shown in this presentation are the current status of the work and do not reflect all GIS data now available to staff, however staff will look specifically at those areas to properly reflect the new developments.
  - Ms. Vivian indicated that Project Team staff has been in contact with Leonard Garoupa and his staff to receive the GIS files and will continue to work with his Department to address specific developments in Southeastern Madera County.
- ⇒ Jeff Roberts and David Lighthall inquired as to why bicycle lane GIS data is not available.
  - Darryl Unruh, City of Fresno indicated that the City would have this data available in the near future.
  - Staff agreed that they would input the data as available by GIS, even if it may just be for the Cities or specific areas of the region.
  - Ms. Vivian again noted that GIS data is not the only input needed for a review of mode shift from autos to bicycling. Other data would need to be developed to logically determine the shift of these modes under various alternative land use and transportation scenarios.
- ⇒ Lynn Gorman inquired as to why schools were not listed in the infrastructure and capital facilities costs. Ms. Gorman also requested that the latest developments regarding the Study should be made available to the Committee and Stakeholder Groups via an email system or some other system.
  - Staff agreed that schools should be added to indicator #1b and that an email network should be set-up and/or a link on Caltrans' website for the study.
- ⇒ Carolina Simunovic, Fresno Metro Ministry asked that the Tier 2 indicator regarding proximity to services to be moved to Tier 1.
  - Staff agreed.
- ⇒ Darryl Unruh asked if INDEX allows you to weight the indicators.
  - Staff replied yes, but it will not be done in this study.
- ⇒ Dennis Manning, FARRC inquired as to whether the indicators should include an assessment of property tax revenues.
  - Project Team staff responded that such an assessment was possible and that the indicator would be added to Tier 2, under Economics.
- ⇒ Teresa Rogerson, Fresno County Bicycle Coalition, inquired where GIS data had been acquired from and whether the Fresno State ISIS Center had been utilized.
  - Mr. Erickson indicated that they have been using the ISIS Center, however a lot of their work is ongoing and many pieces of data will not be complete enough for use during this study.

## ◆ *Final Consensus*

Mr. Erickson asked the group to verify the changes to each category of indicators as a form of consensus. A brief synopsis of the changes to each category is provided below.

### ⇒ Economics

- Schools will be added to the list of facilities considered as part of Tier 1, #1b.
- Tom Boyajian, Fresno City Council member added that he would like to see the costs of fringe development examined. These will also be addressed as part of Tier 1, #1b.
- Property tax issue (tax generation by area) will be examined and added to Tier 2.
- Darryl Unruh added that he would like to see a housing affordability indicator added to the list (relating density to housing cost). Staff will add it to Tier 2.
- Jeffrey Roberts asked that private development cost savings associated with smart growth (such as parking and land costs) be considered in light of different policy requirements. Staff will add it to Tier 2.
- Tom Jordan would like the costs of the automobile and transit vehicle examined.

### ⇒ Congestion Relief

- Darrel Unruh expressed concern over using delay as a measure of congestion since infill development and transit-oriented development often encourage congestion to get people out of cars. Mode split, air quality, delay and trip time all relate to congestion. Discussion led to a decision that averages will be reported but mapping of congestion will be the key indicator result in order for staff and the committees to determine if a scenario is successful as LOS E or F in some areas may have less of a negative impact in one location (say a downtown) as opposed to another (say a suburban stretch of a freeway).

### ⇒ Improved Air Quality

- Staff will work with the Air District to develop appropriate indicators.

### ⇒ Travel Time & Length (Jobs Housing Balance)

- Carolina Simunovic would like to see transit miles and hours traveled added to Tier 1. Staff agreed that they would add it, but use a specific community or area of the region as an example for mapping. Ms. Vivian indicated that possibly concentric rings would be used to define the trip length and time between using transit versus a vehicle.

### ⇒ Land and Water Consumption

- Jeff Roberts would like to see an indicator that shows the change in consumption from agricultural usage to urban development. Staff agreed to add an indicator under Tier 2 but indicated that it may be difficult to develop since agricultural usage in the future is hard to predict and consumption is dependent on crop type.
- The indicator for public parks per capita, Tier 2, #5h will be moved to Tier 1.
- Tier 2 indicator #5l should include privately owned open space preserves.

### ⇒ Travel Mode Shift/Viability of Increased Transit Usage

- Staff will add a bicycle usage indicator to Tier 2.

- Staff will move the indicator relating to proximity of services #4I from Tier 2 to Tier 1.
- ⇒ The City of Fresno indicated that it would forward additional policy references to the Team to add to the tables.

3:55 *Next Steps in the Phase III Process and Closing Remarks*..... Georgiena Vivian

◆ *Continue Collection of Data and Resources*

Ms. Vivian thanked attendees/agencies for providing the data necessary to develop the study and indicated that staff may be contacting them over the next few weeks for additional data.

◆ *Complete Base Case Analysis*

Ms. Vivian indicated that the base case will be developed over the next two months and we hope to have it complete by the end of November.

◆ *Plan Workshop Series #3 to Review Base Case and to Identify Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios*

Ms. Vivian indicated that the next workshop would be held in December 2003 or January 2004 to present the base case and to identify alternative scenarios.

4:10 *Adjournment*..... Georgiena Vivian

◆ *The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 PM.*



## San Joaquin Valley Growth Response Study, Phase III – Joint Workshop #2



WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2003  
2:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
CALTRANS DISTRICT 6 - MANCHESTER CENTER  
YOSEMITE ROOM, #145

### Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Title	Agency
Sherry	Alexander	Trans. Planner	Caltrans
Juan	Arambula	Board of Supervisor	County of Fresno
Diana	Barsotti	Envir. Planner	Caltrans
C.L.	Bauer		
Sharri	Bender-Ehlert		Caltrans
Marc	Birnbaum	Chief, Office of Transportation Planning	Caltrans
Mike	Bitner		Council of Fresno County Governments
Tony	Boren		Council of Fresno County Governments
Tom	Boyajian	City Council	City of Fresno
Kristine	Cai		Council of Fresno County Governments
Carla	Carey		Americorps
Jim	Carl	Associate Director	Sierra Foothill Conservancy
Robert W.	Cervantes		California Department of Transportation/Division of Transportation Planning/Office of Policy Analysis and Research
Kathy	Chung		Council of Fresno County Governments
John	Cinatl	Trans. Planner	Caltrans
Scott	Cochran	Planner	TCAG
Al	Dias	Trans. Planner	Caltrans
John	Downs		Fresno Area Express
Dick	Ellsworth		Pearson Realty (Downtown Improvement Group)
Phil	Erickson		Community Design + Architecture
Marta	Frausto		Caltrans
Leonard	Garoupa	Director	Madera County Resource Management Agency
Lynn	Gorman	Transportation Specialist	County of Fresno
Jeff	Harris		Building Industry Assoc.
Nell	Hill	Trans. Planner	Caltrans
Margaret	Hokokian	Trans. Planner	Caltrans
Tom	Jordan		San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
Daundra	King	Chairman	Downtown Improvement Group



Stacey	Stewart Kurz	Transportation Planner	VRPA Technologies, Inc.
Richard	Lee		Fehr & Peers Associates
Margo	Lerwill		County of Fresno
David	Lighthall	Research Director	Relational Culture Institute
Dennis	Manning		FARRC
Paul-Albert	Marquez	Fresno Regional Planning Coordination	Caltrans
Lidia	Mena-Hermida		U. S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Dev./Office of Field Policy & Mgmt
Patience	Milrod		
Michael	Navarro	Trans. Planner	Caltrans
Ken	Okereu	Planning	Caltrans
Bruce	O'Neal		Land Use Associates
Nick	Paladino		Fresno Cycling Club
Alicia	Parker	Envir. Planner	HWD
Terry	Parker		Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning
Wilma	Quan	DRC Member	Tower District Resident
Teifion	Rice-Evans		Economic & Planning Systems
Jeffrey	Roberts		Granville Homes, Inc.
Teresa	Rogerson		Fresno County Bicycle Coalition
Paul	Saito		Saito Associates
Mike	Sanchez		City of Fresno
Mary	Savala		League of Women Voters
Carolina	Simunovic		Fresno Metro Ministry
Michael	Slater	Attorney's Office	City of Fresno
Brian	Smith		URS
Al	Solis		Sol Development Associates LLC
Jeff	Sorensen	Planner	Caltrans
Barbara	Steck	Program Director	Fresno Business Council
Moses	Stites	Trans. Planner	Caltrans
Jennifer	Taylor	Producer	Specific Pictures
Terrance	Tovar		Fresno Native American Health Center
Darrell	Unruh		City of Fresno
Georgiena	Vivian	Vice President	VRPA Technologies, Inc.
Justin	White		Office of Supervisor Frank Bigelow Madera County
Derek	Winning		Madera County Transportation Commission
John	Wright	Director of Planning & Development Services	City of Clovis
Lydia	Zabrycki	VP Startegic Initiative	EDC
Gilda	Zarate	Outreach	Fresno Native American Health Center